



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,959	01/16/2004	Steven F. Smith	005127.00087	6209
22910	7590	03/10/2006	EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 28 STATE STREET 28th FLOOR BOSTON, MA 02109-9601			PATTERSON, MARIE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3728	

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/758,959

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

Marie Patterson

Art Unit

3728

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 19 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 17, 18, 20 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>marked up drawings (2)</u> . |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-3, 6, 10-14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a or e) as being anticipated by Healy (6568102).

Healy shows a shoe comprising an upper (26), an outsole (22), a heel plate (48) with a plurality of gripping elements (shown in figure 1), and support columns (44) arranged as claimed (figure 2) as claimed. In reference to claim 3, see column 4 lines 30-40 which suggests different dimensions for the columns.

3. Claims 1, 2, and 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Avar (6487796).

Avar shows a shoe comprising an upper (102), outsole (104 and 106), a plurality of gripping elements (figure 4), a heel plate (110 and 114), and support columns (108a-108d) as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Healy.

Healy as discussed above shows a shoe except for in arguendo the exact dimensions of the columns. Healy suggests varying the dimensions of the columns to accommodate a wearers' need (column 4 lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to adjust the dimensions as claimed to provide a desired support arrangement.

6. Claims 4, 5, 9, 19, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Healy or Avar in view of either Dalton (6161315) or Norton (4559724).

Healy or Avar as discussed above shows a shoe substantially as claimed except for the exact traction means. Either Dalton or Norton teaches providing both projections and spikes for traction in running shoes. It would have been obvious to provide both spikes and projections as taught by either Dalton or Norton in the shoe of Healy or Avar to increase traction and to provide a plurality of different traction means for different turf conditions.

In reference to claim 22, the use of insoles and midsoles in athletic footwear are extremely well known and conventional and it would have been obvious to provide such in the shoe of Healy or Avar as modified above to increase comfort, durability, etc..

7. Claims 4-9, 19, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Healy or Avar in view of Patterson (6289611).

Healy or Avar as discussed above shows a shoe substantially as claimed except for the exact traction means. Patterson teaches providing both pyramidal projections and spikes for traction in running shoes. It would have been obvious to provide both spikes and projections as taught by Patterson in the shoe of Healy or Avar to increase traction and to provide a plurality of different traction means for different turf conditions.

In reference to claim 22, the use of insoles and midsoles in athletic footwear are extremely well known and conventional and it would have been obvious to provide such in the shoe of Healy or Avar as modified above to increase comfort, durability, etc..

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 17, 18, 20, and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 1/19/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. .

In response to applicants' arguments directed towards Healy and Avar, both show heel plates which extend downwardly and rearwardly from the outsole at the midfoot as

shown in the attached marked up drawings. The claims do not require that the entire plate be along such an angle only that is extends at said angle, i.e. the plates extend at an angle initially and then have a rear portion which is along the same parallel plane. The claims do not preclude such.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

1. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Other useful information can be obtained at the PTO Home Page at www.uspto.gov.

In order to avoid potential delays, Technology Center 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Center at (572)272-8300 **(FORMAL FAXES ONLY)**. Please identify Examiner Marie Patterson of Art Unit 3728 at the top of your cover sheet.

Art Unit: 3728

Any inquiry concerning the MERITS of this examination from the examiner should be directed to Marie Patterson whose telephone number is (571) 272-4559. The examiner can normally be reached from 6AM - 4PM Mon-Wed.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Marie Patterson', with a stylized, flowing script.

Marie Patterson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3728

